REMARKS

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 112

The Examiner has rejected claims 6 and 24 under 35 USC §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claims 6 and 24 have been cancelled.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102 and § 103

The Examiner has rejected Claims 1-5, 7, 12-23, 25 & 27-29 under 35 U.S.C 102(b) as being anticipated by Reinhardt (U.S. Patent No. 6,747,243). The Examiner has rejected claims 8-11 & 26 under 35 USC 103(a) as unpatentable over Reinhardt. (U.S. Patent No. 6,747,243) in combination with Allen et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0182416 A1). The Applicant respectfully traverses. The cited references fail to teach all of the elements of the claimed invention.

In particular, the cited references fail to teach the element of Claim 7 of "***ablating*** the particle defect with the short pulse laser beam", the element of Claim 17 of "a particle defect ***ablator*** including a short pulse laser ***to ablate*** the particle defects", and the element of Claim 25 of "aligning and focusing a short pulse laser beam on particle defects ***to ablate*** the particle defects." As defined in the Applicants' specification in paragraph 16, ablation is the evaporation and fragmentation of a particle. In contrast, Reinhardt teaches simply removing defects from a surface and not ablating defects. In Col. 11 lines 66-67 and Col. 12 lines 1 – 3 Reinhardt states: "...once the defect is removed from the substrate surface, a cool gas flow, such as nitrogen flow, may be provided over the substrate surface to carry away the removed defect and prevent redeposition of the defect on another area of the substrate surface." This statement in Reinhardt implies that the particle is not vaporized but merely lifted off of the